

Appl. No. 10/817,354  
Response dated 22<sup>th</sup> April 2005  
Reply to Restriction Requirement action of 14-Apr-05

### GENERAL REMARKS


MPEP § 806.04(d), **Definition of a Generic Claim**, reads:

"... Once a claim that is determined to be generic is allowed, all of the claims drawn to species in addition to the elected species which include all the limitations of the generic claim will ordinarily be obviously allowable in view of the allowance of the generic claim, since the additional species will depend thereon or otherwise include all of the limitations thereof. . . ."

As is known, an allowed generic claim may link species embraced thereby.

In sum, an election has been made by applicants based upon a reading of the examiner's requirement as can best be understood to the group of claims directed to group(s) I; and within the species groupings identified by the examiner as having patentably distinct features (i.e., those applicants see as alternative structures for their devices), applicants select, to begin with, species (A). It is understood that, at this point in time, while an election has been made, **no claim** will be cancelled whether it is determined withdrawn from consideration herein for being directed to another of the patentably distinct groupings—identified as such, by the examiner. Please do not hesitate to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2005,



**Macheledt Bales & Heidmiller LLP**  
Jean M. Macheledt  
Attorney for Applicant(s)/Assignee  
Reg. No. 33,956  
Tel. 970.218.6798